

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/490,507	01/25/2000	Takumi Mizokawa	10269/3	7222	
757	7590 03/20/2003				
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE			EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 10 CHICAGO, I			BRATLIE, STEVEN A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3652		
			DATE MAILED: 03/20/2003	DATE MAILED: 03/20/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	TA WALL	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	1011	ZOKAWA Group Art Unit	1 0100
	BRATO	1E	Group Art Unit 3652	
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	rs on the cover sheet b	eneath the c	orrespondence ad	dress
Period for Response	-			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS S MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	ET TO EXPIRE	MONT	H(S) FROM THE	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by defative to respond within the set or extended period for response will, 	a response within the statuto ault, expire SIX (6) MONTHS	ory minimum of the from the mailing	thirty (30) days will be c g date of this communic	onsidered timely.
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	3			·
☐ This action is FINAL.				
Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935			the merits is clos	ed in
Disposition of Claims				
Claim(s)Of the above claim(s)	is/are	is/are pending in the application.		
Of the above claim(s)	is/are	is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.			
Claim(s) 1-13	is/are rejected.			
☐ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.			
☐ Claim(s)	are subject to restriction or election requirement.			
Application Papers		require	ement.	
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing	g Review, PTO-948.			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗆 approved	☐ disapprove	ed.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object	ed to by the Examiner.			
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority un □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of t □ received. 	the priority documents ha	ave been		
 □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number □ received in this national stage application from the Interest 				
*Certified copies not received:	4		······································	
Attachment(s)				
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No.	nterview Sum	mary, PTO-413		
Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	Notice of Infor	mal Patent Applicati	on, PTO-152	
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-94	8 🗆 🤇	Other		

Office Action Summary



Application/Control Number: 09/490,507

Art Unit: 3652

- 1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateyama et al in view of WO 98/19333, Hansen et al and Miller.

Figs. 4-6 for example. Kitalish et al lack the specific conveyor and position detection for the robot. WO 98/19333 discloses a conveyance system including guide rail #44, robot #41 and linear motor #45, see figure 3.

Hansen et al disclose the use of a position detector #91 (column 17 lines 43+) for the linear motor robot or rail #66. Miller discloses the use of position sensors for the robot on the guide rails (col. 8, lines 10-28). It would have been obvious to a mechanic with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a position



Application/Control Number: 09/490,507

Art Unit: 3652

detection system to the primary reference. The motivation is to control the location of the robot. The use of the specific conveyor is merely the substitution of equivalents.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Bratlie whose telephone number is (703) 308-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 to 5:00. Friday is the examiner's day off.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-4177.

Bratlie/kl March 18, 2003

> STEVEN A. BRATLIE PRIMARY EXAMINER

Steven a. Bratlie